

# Final Report



Court Core Data Transfer  
Working Group

CCDT

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

1

## Discussion Agenda

- Premise for CCDT Effort
- Original Plans
- Modifications to the Plan
- Participation
- Work Assignments / Products
- Conclusions
- Concerns
- Next Steps

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

2

## Premise for CCDT Effort

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

3

## Off the Table

- CCDT activity was tabled by the ITAC
  - Originally presented just as IJIS Project started
  - Not reasonable to build a "solution" prior to learning more about the substance of IJIS
  - Irresponsible to expend all too rare JUSTIS resources developing something to only tear it down and rebuild later.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

4

## Do What ?

- Start an ITAC Court Core Data Transfer (CCDT) Working Group to Study the Possible Automated Transfer of Court Data

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

5

## Why?

- Court JUSTIS Access / Data Transfer Policy
  - Consistent Data from a Single Originating Source
  - Eliminate Duplicative / Parallel Data Retrieval Efforts
  - Practical Elimination Multi-Part / Multi-Agency Change Control
- Arrest Core Data Transfer (ACDT)
  - Demonstrated the Applicability
  - Demonstrated the Pitfalls
- IJIS Juvenile Data Saw Challenges Because
  - There is no "Juvenile Community" equivalent to ITAC
  - No way to avoid Piecemeal Requirements

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

6

## Original Plan

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

7

## Planned Steps

- Obtain Detailed Understanding of the Court Goals and Objectives for the Criminal Portion of IJIS Development and Implementation.
- Recognize the Aggressive IJIS Schedule for the Criminal Portion / No time for "Do Overs."
- Understand & Follow Court Policy and Practices
- Develop a Comprehensive Community View of User Data Requirements
- Document Those Data Requirements
- Document Data Presentation
- Document Alternative Delivery Options

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

8

## With Whom ?

### An ITAC CCDT Working Group

- Truly Involved\* Agency Representatives from:
  - ITAC Member Agencies Requiring Timely / Direct Court Input
  - ITAC Member Agencies with Less Urgent Input Requirements
  - JUSTIS Partners & Users Requiring Access to Court Information for Agency Mission / Day-to-Day Operations
  - Participants Attempting to Build Statistical Foundations

\* Attend Work Sessions – Actually Represent Agency

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

9

## Deliverables

- Documentation of Individual Agency Detailed Descriptions of both Current & Anticipated Utilization of Court Data
- Documentation of Individual Agency Data Requirements
- Individual Statements of Agency Time Requirements
- Unified Documentation of "Community" Data Requirements and Time Requirements
- Documentation & Prioritization of Acceptable Delivery Methods
- Screen Displays & Record Layouts for User Consumption

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

10

## Plan

- 06/24/04 – Agreement to Proceed with CCDT Working Group Activities
- 07/06/04 - Agency / Participants Identified
- 07/06/04 - Bi-weekly work Sessions Scheduled
- 07/22/04 - Review and Modification of Presentation for ITAC –
- 08/02/04 - **The Aggressive Schedule:** Activities
- 08/02/04 - **Eight (8)**
- 08/09/04 - **Two (2) Hour Work Sessions**
- 08/16/04 - Individual Agency Court Data Requirements
- 08/23/04 - Individual Agency Data Delivery Requirements
- 09/13/04 - Data / Record Layout Requirements
- 08/13/04 - Screen / Document Requirements
- 09/23/04 - Comprehensive Data Requirements Document, Prioritized Delivery Requirements Presented as Final Report to ITAC

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

11

## Modifications to the Plan

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

12

## New Considerations

Additional challenges were raised by the court. Rather than ignore or postpone discussions of other important automation issues, saving them for either later examination or dispensing with their consideration altogether, the courts took a leadership position in discussing:

automation of documentation, and

data transfer to the courts **from** allied agencies

Although the CCDT Working Group had not documented these activities in their plan, they were eagerly discussed within the work sessions, and basic documentation for these future efforts provided in the Final Report.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

13

## Participation

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

14

## Agency Participation

- Court Services and Offender Supervision
- D.C. Department of Correction
- Metropolitan Police Department
- Office of the Attorney General
- Public Defender Service
- D.C. Pretrial Services Agency
- D.C. Statistical Analysis Center
- D.C. Sentencing Commission
- United State Attorney's Office
- Youth Services Administration
- D.C. Superior Court
- United States Marshal Service
- Office of the Chief Technology Officer
- BearingPoint
- Maximus

**Fifteen (15) Agencies**

**Two (2) Vendors**

**17 Active Partners**

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

15

## Individual Participants

- |   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Anne Grant</li> <li>■ Calvin Johnson</li> <li>■ Cheryl Warner</li> <li>■ Claire Roth</li> <li>■ Dan Cepulio</li> <li>■ Dave Kennamer</li> <li>■ Dave Rosenthal</li> <li>■ Debbie Grafton</li> <li>■ Dennis Garrawantes</li> <li>■ Diana Lowery</li> <li>■ Dwight Edell</li> <li>■ Earl Gillespie</li> <li>■ Ed Hayner</li> <li>■ Elizabeth Wingo</li> <li>■ Greg Hale</li> <li>■ Hans Breville</li> <li>■ James Cronin</li> <li>■ Jeanette Grasco</li> <li>■ John Campbell</li> <li>■ Kim Hunt</li> <li>■ Linda Price</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ MPO</li> <li>■ CSOSA</li> <li>■ DCDC</li> <li>■ PDS</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> <li>■ JUSTIS</li> <li>■ OAG</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> <li>■ PSA</li> <li>■ CSOSA</li> <li>■ DDO</li> <li>■ DCDC</li> <li>■ OAG</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> <li>■ BearingPoint</li> <li>■ DC Sentencing Commission</li> <li>■ Maximus</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> <li>■ DC Sentencing Commission</li> <li>■ Maximus</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Lorenzo Vallone</li> <li>■ Matthew Burke</li> <li>■ Mike Vasquez</li> <li>■ Morgan Messer</li> <li>■ Nancy Gonzalez</li> <li>■ Nancy McDonney</li> <li>■ Nellie Bala</li> <li>■ Patty Scatato</li> <li>■ Paul Melendez</li> <li>■ Phil Heinrich</li> <li>■ Rita Myers</li> <li>■ Renna Chakraborty</li> <li>■ Richard Catalano</li> <li>■ Richard Scheller</li> <li>■ Ron Hickey</li> <li>■ Steve Fuzak</li> <li>■ Steven Gellner</li> <li>■ Tania Ruiz</li> <li>■ Tom Haegele</li> <li>■ Tony Curington</li> <li>■ Wiley Smith</li> <li>■ Willard Stephens</li> <li>■ Yolanda Smith</li> <li>■ Yvonne Martinez</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ PDS</li> <li>■ USMS</li> <li>■ USAO</li> <li>■ CSOSA</li> <li>■ USAO</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> <li>■ OGA</li> <li>■ PSA</li> <li>■ OGA</li> <li>■ OCTO</li> <li>■ RPD</li> <li>■ DCDC</li> <li>■ OAG</li> <li>■ BP</li> <li>■ PSA</li> <li>■ DCDC</li> <li>■ CDOC / SAC</li> <li>■ PDS</li> <li>■ USO</li> <li>■ BearingPoint</li> <li>■ MPO</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> <li>■ CSOSA</li> <li>■ DCSC</li> </ul> |
|---|--|---|--|

**Forty-five Contributing Professionals**

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

16

## Work Assignments / Products

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

17

## Subject / Assignment

### 1. Agency Business Processes Using Court Data

- The first assignment the Working Group accepted was to define their current information relationship with the Superior Court

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

18

## Subject / Assignment

### 2. Requirements for Conversion of Existing Court Data

- As significant to the user as the exciting functionality of any prospective system might be (what new are you offering me?), of equal importance is user apprehension regarding the disposition of the old system (what are you taking from me?). The primary concern of those involved daily in agency's court related business processes is access to data which they have grown to rely upon – old data, historical data, and previous data. As a consequence, the questions regarding the conversion of data from CIS to IJIS were an immediate topic of discussion.
- Agencies were assigned an analysis of their "old" court data requirements.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

19

## Subject / Assignment

### 3. Requirements for Data Availability in the Future Court System

- Every agency information system involving criminal justice information collects data which is not shared with allied justice agencies. In some instances confidentiality is an issue, in some instances legal restraints are in place, in some instances the owner agencies are suspected of selfishness. Seldom do these issues get discussed in an open forum. The CCDT Working Group is an exception.
- The participating agencies were asked to identify the court data they would need in the future to better complete their court related business practices. Immediately the question was raised – What data does the court have? The opinion of the Working Group was that unless they were informed of all available CIS data, they certainly could not reasonably be expected to identify the data requirements from IJIS.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

20

## Subject / Assignment

### 4. Requirements for Automation of Documentation

- Few sets of functionality are more desirable within criminal justice than automated documentation – identify them.
- Hardly any ITAC agencies have had automated creation and distribution of documentation for any length of time. The difficulties in the past were often associated with the lack of technical or systematic capabilities on either the creation or the reception end. While some systems or parts of some systems in some agencies have such capabilities, there has been no effective, foolproof methodology available for all parties. If one agency has full capability to create a document, but cannot send it, or if it can send it but the target agency cannot receive it, or if the process is chancy, or if the process lacks security, non-reputability, proof of origin, or accountability, then in fact, no system exists.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

21

## Subject / Assignment

### 5. Requirements for Data Presentation in Response to Queries

- Users can be easily become distraught and establish a very negative relationship with a new system often simply because it is new and doesn't "look like" the old system. Now this negativity might, on the face of it, appear foolish. However, as often as not, what the user is really saying is that the sequence, layout and/or method of display of data no longer fit their business process. Address issues relative to the initial design of IJIS / JUSTIS output.
- This was a more freeform exercise than any of the other assignments. Several agencies provided narrative descriptions; others offered point-by-point discussions of their views of future JUSTIS displays of IJIS data. Other agencies offered current and planned screen displays resulting from their agency system query methodologies, such as "drilling". In Appendix C one finds both very functional current screen layouts from the USAO and an outstanding presentation by PSA of the new PRISM query methodology, with supporting screen displays.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

22

## Conclusions

- It comes as no surprise to even a novice to criminal justice that the court is the only true central figure in the justice process. All processing either leads to the court or from the court. While there is internal business processes within every agency unrelated directly to court data, the processing would not be done if it were not because the offender was to be forwarded to the court, was in court, or was sent to the agency as a result of the court. Stripping away all agency activities but those directly related to court data activities would, one would imagine, leave very little activity, but quite the opposite is true.

If the pattern presented by the USAO holds true for a majority of all the ITAC participating agencies, then the lessons learned, and the issues IJIS must address, include:

- an agency has a system that is a primary repository of court data
- that primary system spawns data to other agency systems
- the primary or secondary systems spawn documents or support the manual creation of documents that contain court data
- the primary or secondary system tracks the offender's court processing or results, and/or her relationship to court data
- the agency uses the systems maintained to also generate statistics

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

23

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

24

- The agencies each completed an analysis of their conversion requirements, as found on the chart on page 19, the Court Data Conversion Requirements by Date

- The chart shows interesting trends from requiring only relatively recent data, ranging to requirements going as far back as data is available. One notices a vast majority of agencies care little about DC Misdemeanor data prior to 1991. The number interested in older and more recent data is more mixed when considering Traffic and US Misdemeanor information. However the majority of agencies wish as much Felony and SP and Fugitive data as could be converted.

- While this input was well thought out and resulted in a valuable overview of the value of dated data, it was all for naught.

- The court announced it would convert ALL CIS data, dating back to 1978. This was exceptionally well received by the agencies. This eliminated special circumstance or exclusion planning by both courts and agencies, and made a discussion of the term "archive" superfluous.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

25

An assignment required each agency to review the entire list of data and identify:

1. which data is currently obtained by the agency,
2. if the data was not currently obtained, did the agency "wish" the data to be available from IIJS
3. should the data be available from JUSTIS as the result of a JUSTIS query
4. should data be sent to the agency utilizing a "push" methodology
5. if the data were to be pushed, how often (within minutes, hours, days), and
6. Which data should be expected to be part of a court created document.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

26

- Of the 550 data items available in CIS, agencies obtain from 8% to 28% of that data. The community-wide average was 15%. This would lead one to believe that 75% of the data available was of no interest or no value to the other justice agencies.

- The agencies "wished" to obtain anywhere from 148 to 370 additional data items from IIJS that are currently in CIS. This is an increase of 27% to 68% beyond current data made available, an average of a 36% increase.

- The CIS data required to be available as the result of a JUSTIS query to IIJS indicated that only 1% to 68% of court data currently available was required. The wide range within the set of individual results indicated that, on the average, only 27% of court data needs to be displayed on-line. Some agencies identified all data they would expect to see displayed as the result of a JUSTIS query. Several other agencies interpreted the request as asking for the data they would require for as indexable items for search arguments.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

27

- The results of this set of agency entries clearly demonstrated the importance of a push facility. Agencies required anywhere from 51 data items, or 9% of current CIS data, to 325 or 60% of current CIS data to be delivered via push. This range was skewed to the right and resulted in a requirement of 49% of all available CIS data to be delivered through use of a timely, automated, guaranteed push methodology.

- Timeliness was the other issue addressed. Agencies were asked, when identifying the data required to be pushed, the timeframe required for delivery. The following results were found: 41% of the data was required to be delivered within minutes, 9% is required to be delivered within hours, and 50% is required within days. When seen as individual agencies, a least common denominator type analysis would indicate that most data is required within minutes.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

28

- The results from question of data provided by documentation are the most questionable. In effect, the results indicate that from 29% (159 data items) to 38% (207 data items), or an average of between 7% and 33% of current CIS data should be available via documents. We do not think this represents an accurate picture of the justice community's requirements, particularly as the sample is much too small.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

29

- There are approximately 102 automated documents that one agency or another has suggested. We use the term "approximately" advisedly throughout this segment because an agency may have colloquial names for any number of documents, for which other agencies also have their local nomenclature. In addition, a number of documents do not currently exist, and consequently there is no standard name.

- The bulk of the documents listed on the Aggregate Automated Documents Requirements Identification chart represent one-way, one-time use documents. This means that an agency creates the document and it is sent to a receiving agency, for one use.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

30

- We think a case should be made to have PRISM-like methods and displays provided by JUSTIS for IJIS data. This methodology should be the first layer or two of standardized query paths for either agency-centric or individual offender agency records. Perhaps FAST would best be utilized for initial or system-wide queries and well as in-depth relational queries. The analysis to support FAST implementation will have to address these alternatives.
- This drill-down methodology is very successful and provides an excellent model for the IJIS and JUSTIS teams to emulate.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

31

## Concerns

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

32

## We must consider what made the CCDT Working Group efforts so valuable

Value was not only found in the resulting direction and requirements that were documented.

- The effort raised any number of questions that yet must be answered.

These questions represent added value. These questions include:

- Who does what?
- Who pays for what?
- Maintenance and support?
- Automated documents - security, digital signatures, non-repudiation?
- Possible redundancy by FAST?

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

33

## Who does what?

- It would appear that the Courts have full responsibility for the implementation of IJIS. Some would interpret this as ending at a point where users can access IJIS data. A conflicting view has been suggested by the Court's policy regarding access to IJIS; the user interface with IJIS is JUSTIS. Does this mean that the IJIS project's conclusion, relating to user access, is to build a facility that delivers data that should be made available to authorized agencies, only to the JUSTIS hub? This position would transfer the responsibility for the design of queries, their attendant responses/displays, and all "push" routines, to JUSTIS, therefore the ITAC.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

34

## Who pays for what?

- Regardless of the decision whether to complete IJIS without providing access to users, who should pay for the responses/displays, and all "push" routines, regardless of "who" builds them? Many might indicate the Courts have made all the changes affecting both the CIS and the JUSTIS systems, so the Courts must pay for the resulting required changes. Others might indicate that JUSTIS is "community property", and as such, the entire justice community must pay.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

35

## Security, digital signatures, non-repudiation?

- In concert with the earlier issues, how to address automated document transfers? The creation and automation of documents eligible for transfer seem to fall within the sphere of responsibility of the creating agency. However, simply creating the automated document does not "automate" it; to be a "sender" one must have a "receiver." Who designs and pays for the automation and the receipt? One could argue that regardless of the sender, the receiver or the facility that supports the intermediate process, JUSTIS should pay.
- Arguably, making such decisions do not address the more costly activity - security. Security of automated documentation is more than controlling access. A multitude of terms and responsibilities ensue. They include, but are not at all limited to: digital signatures, encryption, delivery methodologies/facilities, and non-repudiation. These terms, quite unfamiliar to most, can be equated to the term "expensive."

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

36

## Maintenance and Support?

- If it is determined that JUSTIS has an active central role in the prior three issues, the obvious question is then, how does the ITAC support and maintain JUSTIS?
- There are a number of basic IT truths that we face: one basic truth is that no system maintains itself; an additional truth is that administrator and managers do not / can not maintain information systems; the third is that maintenance and support are activities at which money must be thrown.
- The questions that then logically arise are: who provides the money, from what source is it obtained, who performs work as the result of the funding?

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

37

## Possible redundancy by FAST?

- If the IJIS query, push, facilitation of automated documentation, et al, are determined to be the responsibility of ITAC and therefore, JUSTIS, and Phase four is to be completed, what is the relationship between the new IJIS system, any new system, any existing system, and JUSTIS access via FAST?
- It is perhaps too early to address this question. However, the question cannot be ignored until Phase Four is completed. At the same time, the IJIS project is an actual effort while Phase Four remains a plan.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

38

## Addenda

### ■ 1. a. Impact Upon Non-Participants

As the Court Core Data Transfer Working Group weekly work sessions were drawing to an end, the court participants expressed deep concern regarding several issues. Some of the issues were resolved and others continue to cause anxiety.

"What do we do now that this ad hoc CCDT effort is complete?"

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

39

## Addenda

### ■ 1.b. Impact Upon Non-Participants

All user agencies must recognize the following facts – discussed at several CCDT work sessions and documented within CCDT meeting notes:

- A conversion to a new, CourtView based system without any parallel processing with CIS.
- The cut over to the new system is planned for May, 2005.
- Data elements as currently delivered will, in many cases be changed in format and in some cases, context.
- These changes may require considerable changes to existing, non DCSC applications.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

40

## Addenda

### ■ 2. Significance of ITAC / CJCC Support Upon Reliability Concerns

- There is no section addressing how reliable the new relationships between the Court's information system, IJIS, the JUSTIS system, and each of the agency information systems must be. The CCDT Working Group Working addressed more fundamental requirements within a broad spectrum of their needs. An underlying assumption was the strength and reliability of the future technical relationships, the rigor with which they would be supported and maintained, and the immediacy of recovery from any faults or problems encountered.

- These substantial, yet unaddressed, concerns became more manifest as the Working Group approached the conclusion of their scheduled exercises. It became more and more apparent that a grand design addressing every requirement would be futile if delivery of information was not within a 99.999% environment.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

41

## Next Steps

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

42



## Keep Collaborating

- We will maintain this positive development environment by the continuation of regularly scheduled meetings of this group of agency representatives throughout the IJIS development and implementation process.
- This will provide the agencies regular and informal access to the IJIS design team, providing the opportunity to express their interests in the design challenges that remain.
- Conversely, the IJIS design team has contributed to this positive atmosphere within the CCDT effort and recognizes the continuation of this group, with leadership from the IJIS Project Manager, as the best method to test ideas and present solutions.

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

43

## Review, Support and Recommend

### ITAC Short-Term Responsibilities:

- Review the Final Report
- Accept / Challenge the direction and findings
- Make recommendations
- Support the development process

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

44

## Provide Forum & Stimulus

### Continuing, Long-Term Responsibilities

- Recognize your critical central JUSTIS role within the justice community
  - Point of Escalation
  - Stage for Arbitration
- Recommend a dependable funding solution for this and future developments to CJCC
  - Direct Focus
  - Offer Solutions

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

45

## Questions Comments ?

- Premise for CCDT Effort
- Original Plans
- Modifications to the Plan
- Participation
- Work Assignments / Products
- Conclusions
- Concerns
- Next Steps

ITAC Presentation 09/23/04

46